

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **August 25, 2004** the Examiner reviewed Claims 1-27. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Reiche (USPN 6,092,196, hereinafter "Reiche").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 19, and 25 were rejected as being anticipated by Reiche. Applicant respectfully points out that Reiche teaches away from the present invention. Specifically, Reiche teaches that a cookie is "*only valid for that particular customer server*" (see Reiche, col. 10, lines 34-35). Moreover, "*if the user wishes to access a resource located on **another** customer server, a new cookie **must** be constructed for the new customer server*" (see Reiche, col. 10, lines 35-38). Furthermore, the procedure for constructing a new cookie requires the user to enter "*his authentication login information, such as his user ID, password*" (see Reiche, col. 9, lines 27-32). In other words, Reiche teaches that authenticating a user across multiple servers **requires** the user to enter the username and password again.

In contrast, the present invention is directed towards authenticating a user across multiple servers **without requiring** the user to enter the username and password again. Specifically, "*client 102 subsequently communicates with a server 111, that does not know about client 102, server 111 will direct client 102 back to authentication server 112, ... At this point, server 111 knows that client 102 is authenticated **without requiring** the user to enter the username and password again*" (see page 9, lines 15-20).


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 19, and 25 to further clarify that the present invention is directed towards authenticating a user without requiring the user to enter the username and password again. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 15-20.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 19, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6, which depend upon claim 1, claims 8-9, which depend upon claim 7, claims 11-15, which depend upon claim 10, claims 17-18, which depend upon claim 16, claims 20-24, which depend upon claim 19, and claims 26-27, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
A. Richard Park
Registration No. 41,241

Date: Oct 26, 2004

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
richard@parklegal.com